UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/561,326	03/16/2007	Kenji Okada	5404/126	5641	
	7590 04/07/200 ER GILSON & LIONE	EXAMINER			
P.O. BOX 1039		LENIHAN, JEFFREY S			
CHICAGO, IL	00010		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1796		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			04/07/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Applica	tion No.	Applicant(s)		
Office Action Summary		10/561,	326	OKADA ET AL.		
		Examin	er	Art Unit		
		Jeffrey L	enihan	1796		
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this commun or Reply	ication appears on t	he cover sheet with the	correspondence ac	dress	
A SHO WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failur Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR HEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MASSIONS OF THE MASSION	AILING DATE OF 7 of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no elunication. atutory period will apply and will, by statute, cause the a	THIS COMMUNICATION COMMUNICATI	ON. timely filed om the mailing date of this c NED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status						
2a)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) file This action is FINAL . Since this application is in condition closed in accordance with the practic	2b)☐ This action is for allowance excep	non-final. ot for formal matters, p		e merits is	
Dispositi	on of Claims					
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□ 8)□ Applicati	Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the a 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/ar Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restrict on Papers The specification is objected to by the	re withdrawn from o				
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: Applicant may not request that any object Replacement drawing sheet(s) including The oath or declaration is objected to	a) accepted or leading and accepted or leading and the drawing (s) the correction is requ	be held in abeyance. Sired if the drawing(s) is contact the drawing(s) is contact the drawing(s) is contact the drawing(s) is contact the drawing(s).	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). objected to. See 37 C	` '	
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
2) D Notic 3) Notic	t (s) e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (P nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date <u>11/04/2008</u> .	TO-948)	4) Interview Summa Paper No(s)/Mail 5) Notice of Informa 6) Other:			

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is responsive to the amendment filed on 12/19/2008.

2. The objections and rejections not addressed below are deemed withdrawn.

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can

be found in a prior Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. Claims 1-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakagawa et al, WO99/43719 (of record), in view of Buhno et al, JP 08-003412 (of record). Nakagawa et al, US6964999, (Nakagawa '999) is utilized as an equivalent English translation of WO 99/43719.

The rejection stands as per the reasons outlined in the previous Office Action, incorporated herein by reference.

5. Claims 1-24 and 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakagawa et al, WO 99/65963 (of record), in view of Buhno et al, JP 08-003412 (of record). Nakagawa et al, US6979716 (Nakagawa '716), is utilized as an equivalent English translation of WO 99/65963.

The rejection stands as per the reasons outlined in the previous Office Action, incorporated herein by reference.

Application/Control Number: 10/561,326 Page 3

Art Unit: 1796

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 12/19/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive

- 7. As discussed in the previous Office Action, both Nakagawa '999 and Nakagawa '716 disclose curable compositions comprising a vinyl polymer having at least one terminal group corresponding to the claimed formula (1). Applicant argues that there would be no motivation to modify either Nakagawa reference, as both references state their respective compositions do "not necessarily require the addition of an antioxidant."
- 8. As noted both in the previous Office Action (¶7, 12) and quoted by applicant in the remarks filed on 12/19/2008 (Page 3, line 20 to Page 4, line 1), both Nakagawa '999 and Nakagawa '716 state that "if desired, the conventional antioxidants and ultraviolet absorbers can be selectively added" to the disclosed compositions. Disclosed examples and preferred embodiments do not constitute a teaching away from a broader disclosure or nonpreferred embodiments (MPEP § 2123 [R-5]). Both Nakagawa '999 and Nakagawa '716 clearly teach that conventional antioxidants may be added as an optional ingredient, and therefore expressly envision compositions containing known antioxidants as alternative embodiments. As noted in the previous Office Action, Buhno teaches that the use of a monoacrylate phenolic compound as an antioxidant for polymer compositions was known in the art at the time the invention was made. The examiner therefore maintains the position that, barring a showing of factual evidence demonstrating unexpected results, it would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the composition of

Application/Control Number: 10/561,326

Art Unit: 1796

either Nakagawa '999 or Nakagawa '716 via the addition of a known monoacrylate phenolic antioxidant, as taught by Buhno.

Page 4

9. The examiner further takes the position that the allegedly unexpected results cited by applicant are not commensurate in scope with the claims as currently written. Examples 1 and 2 in the submitted specification recite compositions wherein the vinyl polymer (I) is an acryloyl diterminal 25% n-butyl acrylate/ 46% ethyl acrylate/29% 2methoxyethyl acrylate copolymer prepared in Production Example 1. Independent claim 1 only requires a vinyl polymer comprising the claimed terminal group, and therefore reads on a polymer prepared from any vinyl monomer. Applicant has not demonstrated that the allegedly unexpected results are obtained using 1) polyolefins, polystyrenes, polymethacrylates, polyvinyl chlorides, etc., all of which are vinyl polymers which have different structures and properties; or 2) any other terminal group wherein R^a of formula (1) is a C₁-C₂₀ alkyl, as claimed. The examiner further notes that Example 1 recites the addition of 0.3 parts of a monoacrylate phenolic antioxidant to 100 parts of the vinyl polymer (I); Example 2 recites the addition of 0.2 parts of a monoacrylate phenolic antioxidant to 100 parts of the vinyl polymer (I). The instant claims, however, do not recite a ratio at which the two components are mixed. Applicant has not provided evidence that the allegedly unexpected results are obtained when the monoacrylate phenolic antioxidant is added at any ratio other than narrow range of 0.2-0.3 parts per 100 parts of vinyl polymer (I).

Conclusion

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey Lenihan whose telephone number is (571)270-5452. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 7:30-5:00 PM, and on alternate Fridays from 7:30-4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James J. Seidleck can be reached on 571-272-1078. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/561,326 Page 6

Art Unit: 1796

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/ Irina S. Zemel/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1796 Jeffrey Lenihan Examiner, Art Unit 1796

/JL/